

II. REMARKS

Respectfully, and generally for the reasons set forth below, the objections and rejections and each ground therefor are traversed, and reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of that which is more particularly set out below with regard to claim 33, the multiple-dependant format has been used for the examination convenience of the Examiner. If allowance is granted, applicant will file an amendment to replace the multiple-dependant claim with respective dependant claims.

A. Paragraphs of Objections and/or Rejections

1. Paragraph 1 of the Office Action

In paragraph 1 of the Office Action, the Examiner has acknowledged consideration of the IDS filed in the case.

In response, appreciation is expressed for the Examiner's consideration.

2. Paragraph 2 of the Office Action

In paragraph 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner has objected to the drawings.

In response, it is noted that the drawings are informal, and formal drawings will be submitted timely after receipt of the Notice of Allowability.

3. Paragraph 3 of the Office Action

In paragraph 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner has provided a courtesy copy of 35 U.S.C. Sec. 102(b), and no need for a response is apparent.

In response, Applicant appreciates the Examiner's courtesy.

4. Paragraph 4 of the Office Action

In paragraph 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 10-14, 16-24, 28, and 29 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. Sec. 102(b). The Examiner contends that these claims are anticipated by Green.

In response, the contention is respectfully traversed, but the rejection also is believed to be moot in view of the amendment. In reviewing the independent claims, counsel observed that claims neglected to require a computer, apparently thereby causing the confusion reflected in the instant Office Action. The claims have been amended to require apparatus, coincidentally avoiding the confusion understandably reflected in the cited art rejection.

4. Paragraph 4 of the Office Action

In paragraph 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner has provided a courtesy copy of 35 U.S.C. Sec. 103(a), and no need for a response is apparent.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's courtesy.

5. Paragraph 5 of the Office Action

In paragraph 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 5, 6, and 15 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. Sec. 103(a). The Examiner contends that these claims are obvious based on Green.

In response, the contention is respectfully traversed, but the rejection is believed to be moot in view of the amendment. In reviewing the independent claims, counsel below observed that claims neglected to require a computer, apparently thereby causing the confusion reflected in the instant Office Action. The claims have been amended to require apparatus, coincidentally avoiding the confusion understandably reflected in the cited art rejection.

7. Paragraph 7 of the Office Action

In paragraph 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner has objected to claims 7-9, 25 and 27 as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but noted that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form incorporating all the limitations of the base claim and those of any intervening claims.

In response, Applicant appreciates the Examiner's acknowledgement of patentability, but in view of the amendments set forth above, it is believed that all claims are

allowable over the cited art. If any art rejection is maintained, support for each contention of Official Notice is requested for the purpose of assessing propriety of a reason to combine with any cited art.

8. Paragraph 8 of the Office Action

In paragraph 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner has made further art of record.

Applicant appreciates Examiner's the making the cited art of record and believes that the cited art does not preclude patentability.


III. Conclusion

The Examiner also has graciously provided numerous ways to communicate regarding the instant case, and the Applicant and undersigned are most appreciative. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set out below if it can in any way expedite or facilitate issuance of a patent on the application.

The application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and favorable action is respectfully requested. Please direct all correspondence to the undersigned at the address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 27, 2001


Peter K. Trzyzna
(Reg. No. 32,601)

P.O. Box 7131
Chicago, IL 60680-7131

(312) 240-0824